REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-65 were originally submitted.

Claims 1, 13, 16, 22, 25, 37, 40 and 53 have been previously amended.

No claims have been canceled.

No claims have been added.

Claims 1-65 remain in this application.

35 U.S.C.§103

Claims 1-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,259,449 to Saxena et al (Saxena) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,459,441 to Perrroux et al (Perroux). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Saxena teaches an integrated communication center or unified graphical user interface (Saxena, col. 4, lines 18-22). Saxena is particularly directed to providing a single unified graphical user interface (Saxena, col. 2, lines 53-54). The integrated communication center (i.e., unified GUI) includes a user interface that provides access to various separate communication programs (Saxena, col. 4, lines 33-36). The communication programs include a speaker phone, video phone, answering machine, fax, email, and web browser accessible through the single integrated interface (Saxena, col. 1, lines 62-65). The Office points out that Fig. 4 of Saxena shows that "GUIs" 500, 600, 700, and 800 are associated with corresponding devices as shown in Fig. 3. As such, the identified individual "GUIs" or user interfaces (i.e., user interfaces 500, 600, 700, and 800) are directed

16

to particular programs. In other words, a "GUI" or user interface is provided for a voice mail program, another user interface is provided for an answering machine program, etc. Furthermore, although the user interfaces identify corresponding devices, the user interfaces do not teach an identifier that identifies the particular user interface (i.e., GUI).

Perroux teaches a method of forming groups of software application functions. Each group is associated with a different characteristic. A GUI object is formed for each function in each of the groups. Each GUI object includes the characteristic associated with its function's group and a second characteristic that distinguishes its function from other functions within its function's group. (See Abstract of Perroux). The GUI object can simultaneously express multiple characteristics and can be part of a graphical user interface (GUI). Multiple characteristic GUI objects can simultaneously suggest both similar and dissimilar associations to a user, and enable a software application designer to indicate functions that are similar, while simultaneously highlighting differences. (Perroux, col. 2, lines 7-12). In particular, Perroux teaches that a computer system can have a GUI that includes different GUI objects, where each GUI object is user-selectable to access functionality associated with a software application. The GUI object identifies the functionality, not the software application. Each GUI object has a first visual characteristic that identifies a first characteristic of the GUI object's associated function, and a second visual characteristic that identifies a second characteristic of the GUI object's associated function. (Perroux, col. 2, lines 33-37).

Independent claim 1, recites in part "displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI being associated with one or

17

more programs operatively configured on a first computing device; and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI, the second GUI being associated with one or more programs operatively configured on a second computing device ... and includes at least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first computing device."

The Office admits that Saxena does not teach "at least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first computing device". The Action relies on Perroux as teaching this element, stating that "Perroux teaches a computer program causing a formation of GUI objects, where each GUI object includes characteristics that distinguish its function from other functions within a group". Applicant respectfully disagrees. Perroux does not teach or suggest "displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen ... and displaying a second GUI on said display screen" as recited in claim 1. Perroux is directed to teaching GUI objects.

Perroux teaches GUI objects that can be a part of or make up a GUI. A GUI object taught by Perroux may have a first visual characteristic that identifies a first characteristic of the GUI object's associated function. The GUI object may also have a second visual characteristic that identifies a second characteristic of the GUI object's associated function. The associating or identifying taught in Perroux applies to GUI objects, not GUIs. In particular, the associating or identifying of the GUI objects of Perroux is directed not to computing devices but to functions, and specifically software application functions. Therefore, Perroux does not teach "at least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first computing device" as recited in claim 1.

18

Neither Saxena nor Perroux teach or suggest this element of claim 1. Accordingly, a rejection based on Saxena and Perroux is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-12 depend on claim 1 and are allowable based at the least on the arguments presented in support of claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 2-12 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 13 recites in part, "generating graphical user interface (GUI) data suitable for being displayed on a display screen, the GUI data being associated with one or more programs operatively configured on a computing device that is configurable to be operatively coupled to another computing device ... wherein said GUI data includes data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device, and identifies the GUI data from other GUI data associated with one or more programs."

The Office admits that Saxena does not teach "GUI data that includes data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device" and relies on Perroux as teaching this element. As discussed in support of claim 1, Perroux does not teach or suggest an identifier that identifies GUI data is associated with a computing device. Perroux teaches GUI objects that are associated with or identify software application functions. There is no teaching or suggestion in Perroux that such GUI objects are associated or identified with a particular computing device.

Neither Saxena nor Perroux teach or suggest this element of claim 13. Accordingly, a rejection based on Saxena and Perroux is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

19

Dependent claims 14-15 depend on claim 13 and are allowable based at the least on the arguments presented in support of claim 13. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 14-15 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 16 recites in part "displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI being associated with one or more programs operatively configured on a first computing device; and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI, the second GUI being associated with one or more programs operatively configured on a second computing device that is operatively connected to said first computing device, and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen and includes at least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first computing device".

The Office admits that Saxena does not teach "GUI data that includes data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device" and relies on Perroux as teaching this element. As discussed in support of claim 1, Perroux does not teach or suggest an identifier that identifies GUI data is associated with a computing device.

Neither Saxena nor Perroux teach or suggest this element of claim 16. Accordingly, a rejection based on Saxena and Perroux is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 17-21 depend on claim 16 and are allowable based at the least on the arguments presented in support of claim 16. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 17-21 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 22 recites in part "generating graphical user interface (GUI) data suitable for being displayed on a display screen, the GUI data being

associated with one or more programs operatively configured on a computing device that is configurable to be operatively coupled to another computing device ... and generating said GUI data to include data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device, and identifies the GUI data from other GUI data associated with one or more programs."

The Office admits that Saxena does not teach "generating said GUI data to include data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device" and relies on Perroux as teaching this element. As discussed in support of claim 1, Perroux does not teach or suggest an identifier that identifies GUI data is associated with a computing device.

Neither Saxena nor Perroux teach or suggest this element of claim 22. Accordingly, a rejection based on Saxena and Perroux is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 22 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 23-24 depend on claim 22 and are allowable based at the least on the arguments presented in support of claim 22. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 23-24 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 25 recites in part "a first graphical user interface (GUI) on said display screen, the first GUI being associated with one or more programs running on said first computing device; a second computing device operatively coupled to said communication link and thusly said first computing device, said second computing device being configured to display a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI, the second GUI being associated with one or more programs operatively configured on said second computing device, and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen

and includes at least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first computing device."

The Office admits that Saxena does not teach "at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first computing device" and relies on Perroux as teaching this element. As discussed in support of claim 1, Perroux does not teach or suggest an identifier that identifies a GUI is associated or not associated with a computing device.

Neither Saxena nor Perroux teach or suggest this element of claim 25. Accordingly, a rejection based on Saxena and Perroux is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 25 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 26-36 depend on claim 25 and are allowable based at the least on the arguments presented in support of claim 25. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 26-36 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 37 recites in part "graphical user interface (GUI) data associated with one or more programs suitable for display on a display screen coupled to said other computing device, wherein if displayed on said display screen said GUI data is configured to use substantially the full screen of said display screen, and wherein said GUI data includes data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device, and identifies the GUI data from other GUI data associated with one or more programs."

The Office admits that Saxena does not teach "at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device" and relies on Perroux as teaching this element. As discussed in support of claim 1, Perroux

22

does not teach or suggest an identifier that identifies GUI data is associated with a computing device.

Neither Saxena nor Perroux teach or suggest this element of claim 37. Accordingly, a rejection based on Saxena and Perroux is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 37 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 38-39 depend on claim 37 and are allowable based at the least on the arguments presented in support of claim 37. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 38-39 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 40 recites in part "displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI including a first object being associated with a first program; and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI, the second GUI including a second object that is the same as the first object being associated with a second program, and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen and includes at least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first program."

The Office admits that Saxena does not teach at "least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first program" and relies on Perroux as teaching this element. As discussed in support of claim 1, Perroux does not teach or suggest identifying that a GUI is not associated with a program. What is taught in Perroux is associating GUI objects with software application functions.

Neither Saxena nor Perroux teach or suggest this element of claim 40. Accordingly, a rejection based on Saxena and Perroux is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 40 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 41-52 depend on claim 40 and are allowable based at the least on the arguments presented in support of claim 40. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 41-52 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 53 recites in part "displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI including a first object being associated with a first program; and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI, the second GUI including a second object that is the same as the first object being associated with a second program, and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen and includes at least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first program."

The Office admits that Saxena does not teach "at least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first program" and relies on Perroux as teaching this element. As discussed in support of claim 1, Perroux does not teach or suggest identifying that a GUI is not associated with a program. What is taught in Perroux is associating GUI objects with software application functions.

Neither Saxena nor Perroux teach or suggest this element of claim 53. Accordingly, a rejection based on Saxena and Perroux is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 53 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 54-65 depend on claim 53 and are allowable based at the least on the arguments presented in support of claim 53. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 54-65 be withdrawn.

24

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1-65 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 9/14/05

By:

Emmanuel A. Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256, ext. 245

25